

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

VOL. 45, No. 4

182

DECEMBER 10, 1951

WHOLE No. 1138

CONTENTS

Robert J. Smutny: The Sources of Cicero's Income	49
Eugene S. McCartney: Resourceful Laziness	56
Reviews	56
<p>F. X. Glimm, J. M.-F. Marique, G. G. Walsh, <i>The Apostolic Fathers</i> (Plumpe); E. V. Marmorale, <i>Giovenale</i> (Sanford); E. Beintker and W. Kahlenberg, <i>Werke des Galenos</i> (Drabkin); V. Pisani, <i>Glottologia indeuropea</i> (Kent); A. Y. Campbell, <i>Euripides, Helena</i> (Kirkwood); M. F. McDonald, <i>Saint Augustine's De Fide Rerum Quae Non Videntur</i> (Pritchard); E. Diehl, <i>Anthologia Lyrica Graeca</i> (Highbarger); J. K. Stirnimann, <i>Die Praescriptio Tertullians</i> (McCracken); J. B. Hofmann, <i>Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Griechischen</i> (Nehring).</p>	
Recent Publications	63
Notes and News	63

THE SOURCES OF CICERO'S INCOME

In a letter to his brother Quintus, written while in exile at Thessalonica, Cicero refers to himself as *genere ipso pecuniae beatissimus* (*Q. Fr.* i. 3, 6). The phrase is generally understood to refer to the large number of legacies he received, which made up by far the largest part of his income, and which were considered in his day perhaps the most honorable and respectable source of income for a man whose career was devoted to politics and the bar. But Cicero had met with such eminent success in his career, and had attained an income which allowed him to live on such a generous scale, that we need not be surprised that there were found unscrupulous people who, for reasons of either jealousy or political expediency, cast suspicion on the means by which the *novus homo* had acquired his wealth. Nor is an interval of nineteen centuries always sufficient to allow the animosities of detractors to die down; there will be found men like Drumann and Mommsen who let escape no opportunity to impute base motives to him or defame his character, frequently with only the thinnest of evidence, as we shall see later. Their work is apt to have a more disastrous effect, too, upon the modern student of Cicero than his ancient detractors had upon the orator himself, because these scholars claim to pronounce judgment after unbiased and scientific consideration of

the facts,¹ whereas no one in ancient times ever took seriously all the attacks and calumny that were heaped upon political adversaries.²

Tenney Frank³ lists some seven methods of acquiring wealth in the later days of the Republic: commerce and trading, provincial investment and money-lending (Pompey, Brutus, Atticus), managing and enlarging a modest inheritance (Atticus), dealing in real estate (Crassus), the legal profession, acting (Roscius, Aesopus), and provincial government. Cicero himself mentions three ways of attaining wealth honorably: engaging in commerce, contracting for public works, and farming the revenues (*Parad. Stoic.* 46). But these methods were closed to a man with political ambitions. What, then, were the sources from which Cicero derived his income—an income which allowed him to purchase Crassus' house on the Palatine for 3,500,000 sesterces (*Fam.* v. 6, 2), to live as lavishly as his social equals, and finally to be the owner of some eight

¹ Cf. the admirable Introduction, pp. 1-21, and especially pp. 18 f., of Boissier, *Cicero* (for bibliographical data on this and other works cited by short title in these notes, see the list which follows note 45, below).

² Cf. (Pseudo?) Sallust's *Invective against Cicero*. E. H. Clift, in her *Latin Pseudepigrapha* (Baltimore, 1945), pp. 92-97, argues very convincingly for the authenticity of this work.

³ Frank, *Survey*, I (1933), 394 f.

country estates plus several lodges?⁴ Let us examine the available evidence regarding the sources of this wealth.

His patrimony must have formed the first basis of the wealth he acquired. It was only a moderate one, consisting of an estate at Arpinum (*Att.* i. 16. 18; cf. *De leg.* ii. 3) and a house at Rome in the Carinae. He seems to have made the latter house over to his brother after purchasing his mansion on the Palatine.⁵ This is all the patrimony of which we have any direct evidence. Drumann, however, ascribes another house and an amount of cash to his inheritance. The grandfather of the orator, he argues, must have had, besides his estate near Arpinum, a house in the town proper;⁶ but why he feels that this house (if indeed it did exist) was left to the orator rather than to his brother or his cousin Lucius, son of the orator's uncle, is not clear. Drumann's assumption that the paternal inheritance included a certain amount of ready money, the interest from which, plus the proceeds of the estate, provided the two brothers with moderate means, is indeed a logical one, but there is no evidence cited to substantiate it.⁷

But whether or not Drumann is correct in his assumptions, it is clear that Cicero's inheritance was a modest one and could have served only as the nucleus of his later fortune. Indeed, it would have taken the husbandry of more than an Atticus to swell this patrimony into the wealth he subsequently acquired.⁸

The dowry which Terentia brought him about the year 77 was a considerable one. Plutarch states that it amounted to 120,000 denarii,⁹ but we are not told what form it took. From the letters we know that at least part of it consisted of houses in the city in the Argiletum and on the Aventine, for when the younger Marcus is completing his education at Athens, we find that the

annual rents from these houses, 80,000 sesterces, are to constitute his allowance¹⁰—an amount equivalent to what Publius or Lentulus the flamen give their sons (*Att.* xii. 7. 1). It is interesting to note that the returns from these houses were apparently already earmarked for the education of the younger Marcus when he was quite young,¹¹ and that this plan was not altered, even though Cicero had divorced Terentia in the meanwhile. For though divorce entailed restitution of the dowry, in cases where the divorce occurred through fault of the woman the law allowed the husband to retain one-sixth of the marriage-portion for each child, up to a maximum of three-sixths (*retentio propter liberos*).¹² Since the proceeds of these houses were assigned to Marcus' support and thus seem to constitute such a retention, it would appear that the court must have judged Terentia to blame for the divorce. If we are correct in regarding

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY is published weekly from mid-November for sixteen issues, except for any weeks in which there is an academic vacation. Volume 45 contains issues dated November 12, 26; December 3, 10, 17 (1951); January 7, 14, 21, 28; February 4, 25; March 3, 10, 17, 24, 31 (1952).

Owner and Publisher, The Classical Association of the Atlantic States. Place of Publication, Hunter College in the Bronx, 2900 Goulden Avenue, New York 68, N. Y.

General subscription price, \$3.75 per volume in the Western Hemisphere; elsewhere \$4.25. Price to members of the C. A. A. S., \$3.25. All subscriptions run by the volume. Single numbers, to subscribers, 20 cents, to others, 30 cents prepaid (otherwise 30 cents and 40 cents). If affidavit to invoice is required, 60 cents must be added to the subscription price. For residents of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, and the District of Columbia, a subscription to THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY (or, alternatively, to the *Classical Journal*) is included in the membership fee of the C. A. A. S., whose members are also entitled to the *Classical Outlook* and the *Classical Journal* at special prices in combinations available from the Secretary-Treasurer of the C. A. A. S., Eugene W. Miller, 3328 Cathedral of Learning, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh 13, Pa.

Reentered as second class matter December 14, 1950 at the post office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in the Act of February 28, 1925 authorized December 14, 1950.

STAFF

EDITOR

Harry L. Levy.....Hunter College in the Bronx
2900 Goulden Avenue, New York 68, N. Y.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

Edward A. Robinson....Fordham University, New York 58, N. Y.
[On leave of absence, 1951-1952]
Ellenor Swallow.....Barnard College, New York 27, N. Y.

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

Lionel Casson.....New York University, New York 3, N. Y.
William H. Stahl.....New York University, New York 53, N. Y.
Waldo E. Sweet....Wm. Penn Charter School, Philadelphia 44, Pa.

ASSISTANT EDITOR

Stanislaus Akielaszek....Fordham University, New York 58, N. Y.
[Also serves ad interim as C. A. A. S. Secretary
for Distribution of Publications]

⁴ *Att.* xii. 7. 1; Drumann-Groebe, *Gesch.*, VI (1929), 336-47; Carcopino, *Secrets*, I, 87-89. The precise number of *deversoria* is uncertain. Cf. Lichtenberger, *Priv.*, pp. 15 f. Carcopino estimates the total value of Cicero's landed property at 10,000,000 sesterces (*Secrets*, I, 88-92).

⁵ *Plut. Cic.* 8. 3; *Cic. Q. Fr.* ii. 3. 7.

⁶ Drumann-Groebe, *Gesch.*, V (1912), 221; VI (1929), 330.

⁷ *Ibid.*, VI (1929), 330. Cf. Petersson, *Biography*, p. 215.

⁸ Cf. Dio Cassius xxxviii. 20. 3: "Most of these things were not yours by inheritance."

⁹ *Cic.* 8. 2. There is a variant reading which sets the figure at 100,000 denarii. The subject of Terentia's dowry has been treated by M. van den Bruwaene, *Études sur Cicéron* (Brussels 1946) 11-29.

¹⁰ *Att.* xii. 32. 2, 7. 1, 24. 1; xvi. 1. 5.

¹¹ It seems likely that these same houses are alluded to in a letter to Terentia written while Cicero was in exile (*Fam.* xiv. 1. 5): *Quod . . . scribis te vicum vendiditram . . . quid pueri misero fiet?*

¹² *Ulpian* vi. 9 f. Text and translation are available in J. T. Ahdy and B. Walker, *The Commentaries of Gaius and Rules of Ulpian* (3rd ed.; Cambridge, 1885).

these houses as a *retentio propter liberos*,¹³ it follows that they did not make up the entire dowry and that Terentia must have brought Cicero additional assets. Unfortunately, as has been said, we have no evidence concerning the form which these assets took.

But whatever the precise amount of Terentia's dowry, Cicero must have enjoyed the use of it for a long time, at least some twenty-five years. In that length of time, the rent from these city houses alone (if we assume that the annual rate remained a constant 80,000 sesterces) would have totaled 2,000,000 sesterces. Finally, he was obliged to restore the dowry to her, subject to the deduction mentioned. It is doubtful, however, whether Terentia ever recovered the entire amount due her, for as late as November 44 we find Cicero still concerned with the difficulty of meeting this obligation (*Att.* xvi. 6. 3, 15. 5).

While we are on the subject of dowries, a word should be said of Publilia's. We need not be concerned long with it, for though it seems Cicero married his wealthy ward primarily for her money, to enable him to pay off the debts which pressed him from every side, we have no exact information regarding the amount of her fortune. Besides, by that late date Cicero had already acquired the greater part of his property. This marriage with Publilia was dissolved in 45, and we do not know with certainty whether Cicero succeeded in repaying her dowry in full before his death. In view of his financial embarrassment at the time of the divorce it appears highly improbable. At any rate, the last letter containing an allusion to this transaction indicates that the matter had not yet been brought to a conclusion.¹⁴

From the discussion thus far it becomes apparent that much the greater part of the orator's wealth and property must have been acquired by his own efforts, chiefly from his practice at the bar. His income from this source falls into two divisions: rewards given the advocate while the client was still living, and rewards given after the death of the client, i.e. remuneration by means of legacies. We shall leave consideration of the latter category until later; at present we shall concern ourselves only with remuneration tendered by clients still living. Inasmuch as there was a law at Rome dating from the end of the third century, the *Lex Cincia de donis et muneribus*,¹⁵ which, among other restrictions, forbade the acceptance of any fees or gifts by advocates, it would be helpful to know exactly to what ex-

tent this statute was still observed in Cicero's day. That there were violations of this law we know: Hortensius himself accepted the gift of an ivory Sphinx when pleading Verres' case (*Plut. Cic.* 7. 6). On the other hand, Cicero shows concern over the application of the law in connection with a gift of some books from Papirius Paetus (*Att.* i. 20. 7). However, Tyrrell and Purser point out, rightly, I think, that Cicero's remark in this passage may be merely playful, resulting from the coincidence of the names *Cincius* and *Lex Cincia*.¹⁶ In the face of the conflicting evidence there is a tendency toward consensus of opinion among modern scholars such as Boissier,¹⁷ Drumann,¹⁸ and Tyrrell and Purser¹⁹ that this law was but imperfectly observed toward the close of the Republic.

Boissier lists four classes of people who must have been indebted to Cicero for his defense of them: nobles whose honor or fortune he had saved, towns or provinces he had protected against greedy governors, foreign princes he had defended in the Senate, and above all, the tax-farming corporations of *equites* whose interests were always of great concern to him.²⁰ It is inconceivable that the advocate should not have profited from the obligations of such powerful clients. Of course, payment could not be made legally by outright fees or gifts, since these were prohibited by the *Lex Cincia*.

The Sallustian *Invective* against Cicero is interesting for showing what profits an unscrupulous lawyer of that day could make. In it Cicero is accused of trying some of the Catilinarian conspirators at his own house and condemning them to pay fines. The fine of one was used to purchase his Tusculan estate, of another his Pompeian, and of still another to buy his house in the city. The men who could do nothing for him were most liable to false accusation. Cicero is requested to render an account of the amount of his patrimony and of what came to him through lawsuits, and he is asked where he got the money to buy his house and build his villas at Tusculum and Pompeii regardless of the expense. Further on, he is maligned with phrases like *ex M. Crassi familia* and *mercenarius patronus*.²⁰ However, the Roman

¹⁶ Tyrrell-Purser, *Corr.*, I (1904), 39, note *, and *ibid.*, p. 243 (on *Att.* i. 20. 7 *Cinciam*). Carcopino, *Secrets*, I, 149-52, prefers to see in this gift of books a genuine violation of the *Lex Cincia* on Cicero's part. However, as Carcopino himself points out (*Secrets*, II, *passim*, esp. 459-62), any act detrimental to Cicero's character which rests on the evidence of the letters alone must be accepted with extreme caution in view of the purpose of publication of the correspondence, which, Carcopino maintains, was to serve as propaganda for Octavian. Hence the letters were so manipulated as to cast the great leader of the republican opposition in the worst possible light.

¹⁷ *Cicero*, p. 82.

¹⁸ Drumann-Groebe, *Gesch.*, VI (1929), 330.

¹⁹ Tyrrell-Purser, *Corr.*, I (1904), 39.

²⁰ Boissier, *Cicero*, p. 84.

²⁰ (Pseudo?) Sallust, *Invective against Cicero*, esp. 3-5.

¹³ Reents, *Property*, p. 100, generously attributes the surrender of the houses to Terentia's magnanimity, but the more practical view of the matter seems more probable.

¹⁴ *Att.* xvi. 2. 1 and 6. 3. For the interesting theory that Cicero decided to divorce Publilia when he again became financially solvent through the Cluvian legacy, see Carcopino, *Secrets*, I, 247 f.

¹⁵ Tac. *Ann.* xi. 5, xiii. 42; Cic. *De sen.* 10; Livy xxxiv. 4. 9.

tendency toward exaggeration in maligning one's legal and political opponents is well-known, and we can be certain that if there were any truth in charges of this sort against Cicero, they would have found their way into regular histories and biographies.

At any rate, less material, or at least less tangible, rewards were quite possible. Clients could (and were expected to) cast their own votes for their benefactor when he was running for public office, and influence their friends and dependents to do likewise.²¹ This undoubtedly was the best way in which the *equites* could repay him. In the *Commentariolum petitionis*, Quintus twice alludes to the fact that his brother should make it known to clients who have enjoyed the benefits of his defence in court that now, when he is running for the consulship, is the time for them to remember their obligations to him (20; 38). Clearly then, if people are still under obligation to the advocate who won their cases for them, he cannot have accepted any fee or other form of remuneration in return for his services at the time of the trials. This is confirmed by Plutarch (Cic. 7. 3), and even Drumann is willing to admit it.²²

However, when Cicero found himself short of money, he preferred to borrow from rich men whom he had defended; being obliged to him, they were apt to be less harsh and more patient creditors.²³ Aulus Gellius cites an instance along these lines (N.A. xii. 12. 2). When Cicero was purchasing his mansion on the Palatine, he borrowed two million sesterces from a client of his, Publius Sulla, who was then under accusation. It is assumed that this was a "loan" which was never intended to be repaid. But neither this inference of Aulus Gellius' nor Cicero's own statement *homines intellegere coeperunt licere amicorum facultatibus in emendo ad dignitatem aliquam pervenire*²⁴ constitutes any proof of what may or may not have been repaid. We have no further evidence regarding this particular loan, but we do know that Cicero was forever borrowing and repaying money, and that he was anxious for his debts to be paid, if only to maintain his reputation (*Att.* xvi. 2. 2).

We have no evidence of any rewards he received from pleading cases of foreign princes in the Senate, though undoubtedly they found some means of expressing their gratitude. From the cases of the provincials, however, we know that he derived great benefits. Plutarch is our source for the generosity which the Sicilians

manifested toward their patron for his conduct of their case against Verres (Cic. 8. 1). When Cicero was aedile in 69, he did not possess the personal fortune to enable him to put on as lavish games as the populace liked; but thanks to his grateful clients the Sicilians, he was able to ingratiate himself with the urban populace no less effectively than if he had put on the grandest of spectacles, for at a time of food scarcity and high prices the islanders came to his rescue with large quantities of live-stock and produce, which he utilized not for personal aggrandizement but merely to lower the price of food. Thus Cicero, without running any risk of tangling with the Cincian Law, derived from his legal practice what constituted for him a far more desirable reward—political preferment.

However, his legal practice was not by any means devoid of financial remuneration. The accepted procedure in paying advocates at Rome seems to have been to include a clause in one's will in favor of the advocate. This brings us to a consideration of what was undoubtedly the largest single source of Cicero's income—legacies.

When the "Cicero" of the spurious *Invective against Sallustius Crispus* defends himself regarding the source of his income, he retorts that his wealth was derived from legacies (9). This is in the main almost certainly true, for Cicero himself, near the close of his life, tells us that he has received over 20,000,000 sesterces in this way (*Phil.* ii. 40). Such a large return in legacies is in keeping with what we know of Roman customs of the time. There were two principal reasons for remembering someone with a bequest. One was the custom of discharging any obligations of gratitude incurred during life by a bequest in favor of the benefactor; the other seems to have been a matter of sheer vanity. Wealthy testators, in order to appear to have numerous friends, frequently engaged in the practice of dividing their estate among many persons. Naturally the most eminent public characters were chosen as the objects for this bounty, as it was believed that such persons would bring more distinction to the testator's name and reputation. The purpose of such a bequest was entirely selfish; as Tyrrell and Purser^{24a} point out, it was not intended to serve as a tribute to the character or the politics of the legatee. Boissier brings this out in a very effective paragraph, which I quote:

Sometimes people were brought together in it who seldom met anywhere else, and who must have been surprised to find themselves there. Cluvius, a rich banker of Puteoli, left his estate to Cicero and Caesar after Pharsalia. . . . The architect Cyrus placed among his heirs both Clodius and Cicero, that is to say, the two persons who most heartily detested each other in Rome. . . .

²¹ Cf. L. R. Taylor, *Party Politics in the Age of Caesar* (Berkeley, 1949), pp. 7 f.; Carcopino, *Secrets*, I, 157-59.

²² Drumann-Groebe, *Gesch.*, VI (1929), 331.

²³ Cf. Boissier, *Cicero*, p. 83; Lichtenberger, *Priv.*, p. 31.

²⁴ *Att.* i. 13. 6. Whether there was anything shady about this loan remains a highly controversial issue. For views on either side, cf. Lichtenberger, *Priv.*, pp. 34 f. and Carcopino, *Secrets*, I, 160-65.

^{24a} Tyrrell-Purser, *Corr.*, I (1904), 40.

This architect, no doubt, regarded it as an honour to have friends among all parties. It even happened that a man set down in his will people whom he had never seen. Lucullus augmented his immense wealth by bequests which unknown persons left him while he governed Asia. Atticus received a good number of legacies from people of whom he had never heard, and who knew him only by reputation. How much more then must a great orator like Cicero, to whom so many were under obligation, and of whom all Romans were proud, have been often the object of this posthumous liberality! We see in his letters that he was the heir of many persons who do not seem to have held a large place in his life.²⁵

However, of the numerous legacies which Cicero received, we frequently cannot tell which came from grateful legal clients, which from his political admirers, and which from individuals for whom he had exerted his influence by means of letters of recommendation.²⁶ The question, though an interesting one, is not of importance in the present study. More significant to us are their size and nature. To the list of thirteen compiled by Drumann²⁷ should perhaps be added the one of 90,000 denarii mentioned by Plutarch (*Cic.* 8. 2). Most of them, however, were probably small. On one occasion he describes an inheritance as *quantulacumque* (*Att.* vi. 9. 2), on another he refers to legacies categorically as *raudusculum* (*Att.* xiv. 14. 5). Unfortunately, with the exception of the legacy mentioned by Plutarch, just alluded to, we cannot be sure of the amount of any of them, though in the case of the Cluvian legacy, which he received in 45 B.C., we learn from Cicero that the income from the property amounted to 80,000 sesterces the first year, and was expected to reach well-nigh 100,000 the second (*Att.* xiii. 46. 3, xiv. 10. 3, 11. 2). It is interesting to note by way of comparison that the first year's income, 80,000 sesterces, was precisely the amount of the allowance of the younger Marcus at Athens. The only other legacy for which any figure is given is that of the philosopher Diodotus, a teacher of Cicero's, who left his fortune to his patron on his death in 59 (*Att.* ii. 20. 6). According to the manuscripts, this amounted to 10,000,000 sesterces, but scholars agree that we are here confronted with a textual error, and that the proper reading must be 100,000 sesterces.²⁸

Apparently scholars feel that it must have been just as impossible for an ancient teacher to leave such a sum as it is for his modern American counterpart!

In view of this paucity of evidence regarding the specific amounts of the inheritances, we are thrown back upon Cicero's own total figure of over 20,000,000 sesterces. Some feel that this figure is unreliable, a mere rhetorical hyperbole.²⁹ Petersson states that it is impossible to decide whether it is exaggerated or not,³⁰ Boissier³¹ and Drumann³² accept it without comment, and Tenney Frank goes so far as to make it the basis of his estimate of Cicero's average annual income.³³ The latter calculates that 20,000,000 sesterces, received over a period of approximately thirty years, would yield an annual income of somewhat over 600,000 sesterces, or ca. \$30,000. Frank assigns this yield exclusively to Cicero's law practice, but as we have pointed out above, only part of these legacies came from legal clients; the rest was given by friends, relatives, and admirers.

Another large source of income for the orator consisted of the rent from various properties and estates. We have already mentioned, in the discussion of Terentia's dowry, the houses in the Argiletum and on the Aventine, the rents from which must have amounted to at least 2,000,000 sesterces before the houses were turned over to the support of the younger Marcus.

The only other productive urban property which we know with certainty³⁴ Cicero possessed was some shops at Puteoli which are cracking and collapsing when he first mentions them in April 44 (*Att.* xiv. 9. 1, 11. 2). These shops appear to have been part of the legacy from Cluvius, a rich banker of Puteoli, who died in 45. Cicero speaks of rebuilding this property with a view to turning his loss into profit. Whether these plans were successful we do not know, since there is no further mention of the shops. The reconstruction probably was approaching completion about the time the second *Philippic* was composed (October 44), and hence Cicero's estimate of 20,000,000 sesterces cannot include any income from this source. At any rate, whatever the increased yield amounted to, it came late in his life, within slightly more than a year of his death, when the greater

²⁵ Boissier, *Cicero*, p. 85.

²⁶ For the details of the circumstances attending these bequests, cf. Mohler, *Legacies*.

²⁷ Drumann-Groebe, *Gesch.*, VI (1929), 331-33. This list, consisting only of those legacies for which we have definite evidence, is in all probability by no means complete, for Cicero's correspondence for his earlier years is very scantily represented, there are several periods for which we have no letters at all, and finally we have no assurance that all the bequests would necessarily occasion mention in the letters.

²⁸ Tyrrell-Purser, *Corr.*, I (1904), 39; also *ibid.*, p. 322 (on *Att.* ii. 21. 6 *HS fortasse centiens*); Boissier, *Cicero*, p. 85; Drumann-Groebe, *Gesch.*, VI (1929), 331. For argument in support of the opposite view, cf. Mohler, *Legacies*, p. 77. If one

accepts Mohler's view, there can be no question of the reliability of the total figure of 20,000,000 sesterces, for the bequest of Diodotus alone would constitute one-half.

²⁹ Thus Tyrrell-Purser, *Corr.*, I (1904), 39, note f, and Reents, *Property*, pp. 45 f.

³⁰ *Biography*, p. 217.

³¹ *Cicero*, pp. 85 f.

³² Drumann-Groebe, *Gesch.*, VI (1929), 330.

³³ Frank, *Survey*, I (1933), 395.

³⁴ Carcopino, *Secrets*, I, 76, argues for at least one more *insula* in Rome, and possibly two more, on the basis of *Att.* xv. 26. 4. The text of this letter, however, is so corrupt that any conclusion drawn therefrom must necessarily be unreliable.

part of his fortune had already been acquired. Thus it cannot have represented any large addition to his means.

Income from landed property was considered the most respectable form of wealth for nobles and statesmen in republican days, and from his country estates—or some of them, at least—Cicero must have had some of his steadiest, albeit not largest, income. From various references in the letters we know that he drew rent from at least some of them,³⁵ and we see him making the rounds of his estates to inspect them and tend to such matters as improvements and rent adjustments (*Att.* ii. 8. 2; xiii. 9. 2, 11. 1). Unfortunately, in getting down to specific amounts we are, as usual, at a loss for precise information. In a letter to Tiro (*Fam.* xvi. 18. 2) we learn that a truck-gardener on his Tusculan estate paid him 1,000 sesterces, but it is not stated whether this was the monthly or the annual rate. In the *Paradoxa Stoicorum* (49) he states that his *praedia* yield 100,000 sesterces annually, but we are faced with much the same problem in connection with this figure as with the total of his legacies. There is no positive indication that this amount represents his actual income rather than a mere round number chosen for argument's sake. However, if we accept, with Tenney Frank, the other figure of 20,000,000 sesterces, we may perhaps accept this one also. In the same passage of the *Paradoxa*, Cicero indicates that one can live lavishly on an income of 600,000 sesterces, and this amount, as Tenney Frank points out,³⁶ approximately equals Cicero's own income. Perhaps, then, this figure of 100,000 sesterces is also not too far from the true one.

That the provinces were an abundant source of lucre to both military leaders and governing officials is well known. From Cilicia Cicero writes to a friend, probably semi-seriously: *Cum una mehercule ambulatuncula atque uno sermone nostro omnes fructus provinciae non confere* (*Fam.* ii. 12. 2). Regardless of whether Cicero himself ever became wealthy at the provincials' expense, many of the greatest fortunes of the last days of the Republic were the result of military campaigns in the provinces. Chief among these were those of Lucullus, Caesar, and Pompey.³⁷ Cicero alludes to the fortunes acquired by Labienus, Mamurra, and Balbus (*Att.* vii. 7. 6), and shortly after the outbreak of the Civil War, Pompey promises to be more liberal even than Caesar in largesse (*Att.* ix. 9. 2). And Cicero himself advises Trebatius to acquire wealth while in Gaul and Britain with Caesar (*Fam.* vii. 11. 3).

There were various means for civil officials also to enrich themselves. One could pillage ruthlessly, as that classic example, Verres, did. The possibilities of bribes were inexhaustible; they were offered by everyone from local conspirators to entire cities which desired to escape the billeting of troops within their territory (*Att.* v. 20. 6, 21. 7). A custom existed of presenting the governor with a large gift, which Cicero tells us that he, as proconsul of Cilicia, refused, and which amounted to over \$100,000 (*Att.* v. 21. 11 f.). Various sorts of shady transactions with grain and supplies could be engaged in.

But such means of self-enrichment Cicero abhorred; certainly they are not in keeping with what we know of his ethical principles, and tradition has preserved no violently contradictory evidence. We have already mentioned the manner in which the grateful Sicilians repaid their obligation to him during his aedileship. Undoubtedly he considered this an ample reward for his benevolent quaestorship. After his praetorship and consulship he declined provinces—proof in itself that he was not greedy for provincial lucre.³⁸ In the year 51, however, he was compelled to accept a province and accordingly departed for Cilicia. He stayed there but a year; yet upon his departure he writes that he has deposited 2,200,000 sesterces with the publicans at Ephesus (*Att.* xi. 1. 2). Although it is uncertain just what the source of this money was, we have Cicero's statement (*Fam.* v. 20. 9) that it was acquired *salvis legibus*. Surely it does not represent the unspent residue from the sum voted him by the Senate for expenses, for in another letter he informs Atticus that after leaving a year's allowance to his quaestor out of his own allowance, he paid back into the treasury one million sesterces,³⁹ to the great dismay of his staff, who felt that this money rightfully belonged to them. In still another letter he corroborates the fact that what had been assigned him for expenses of administration (*quae mihi attributa est*) is in the quaestor's care, while the proceeds of the military booty were left to the soldiery.⁴⁰

³⁸ There is some reason to suspect that Cicero may have received some financial compensation from his colleague Antonius Hybrida for surrendering his province of Macedonia to him: cf. *Att.* i. 12. 1 f., and Tyrrell-Purser, *Corr.* I (1904), 192, *ad loc.* Drumm-Groebe, *Gesch.* V (1912), 452-54, VI (1929), 350, inclines toward the belief that the suspicion is justified; Carcopino, *Secrets*, I, 206-30 (but cf. note 16, above), goes so far as to attempt to prove that the money from Antonius was to be applied towards payment for Cicero's Palatine mansion. Boissier, *Cicero*, pp. 81 f., is certain that Cicero received nothing, and Petersson, *Biography*, p. 216, note 20, feels that it is impossible to form any definite opinion.

³⁹ *Att.* vii. 1. 6. However, the figure given in the MSS may not be correct.

⁴⁰ *Fam.* ii. 17. 4. This would seem to refute Lichtenberger's view (*Priv.*, p. 40) that the 2,200,000 sesterces were obtained from the sale of the commander's share of the booty. Cf. Carcopino, *Secrets*, I, 203.

³⁵ *Att.* xi. 2. 2, xiii. 11. 1; *Fam.* xvi. 18. 2. For a more detailed investigation of the possible sources of income from Cicero's several estates, see Reents, *Property*, pp. 35 f., 51-57.

³⁶ Frank, *Survey*, I (1933), 393.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 398 f.

Drumann, with his usual unsympathetic attitude toward Cicero, cannot refrain from assigning one more source of income to the orator from his province: the acceptance of gifts of statues and paintings for his house and villas, which he is supposed to have proceeded to decorate without cost.⁴¹ This assumption, however, rests on the very dubious implications of Cicero's interest in certain sumptuary legislation. In 50 B.C. Appius Claudius as censor brought up in the Senate a measure to limit the amount of money which private persons were permitted to spend on works of art, and Cicero asks to be informed whether the bill passes (*Fam.* viii. 14. 4; *Att.* vi. 9. 5). So far is this interest from proving that Cicero accepted works of art as gifts, that it seems to indicate the opposite—that he is worried that he may not be able to spend as much as he wishes.

The sole proceeds, then, of his proconsulship seem to consist of the 2,200,000 sesterces. This money undoubtedly brought interest while it remained with the publicans at Ephesus. But very shortly he suffered the loss of at least half of this sum, as we shall see below when we consider Cicero as a lender.

The letters to Atticus teem with references to lending and borrowing. Though lending money at interest was a means of acquiring wealth frequently practiced even by outstanding political figures of the day—one need only recall Brutus and the Scaevola affair in Cilicia, or Pompey's loans to Asiatic kings—this can not rightly be called a source of income for Cicero.⁴² It becomes apparent from even a very casual perusal of the letters that there was as much borrowing as lending. He informs us himself on one occasion that his outstanding loans would cover his debts, but his following remarks are still better proof that he did not derive any profit from financial transactions of this sort (*Att.* xvi. 2. 2):

Quamquam enim reliqua satis apta sunt ad solvendum, tamen fit saepe ut ii qui debent non respondeant ad tempus. Si quid eius modi acciderit, ne quid tibi sit fama mea potius. Non modo versura, verum etiam venditione, si ita res coget, nos vindicabis.

In another letter we find him considering the possibility of raising money by converting plate at the treasury, since none of his debtors is paying up.⁴³

We have already alluded to the possibility that the 2,200,000 sesterces, the proceeds of his proconsulship, which were left at Ephesus, drew interest. In January 49, only seven months after the expiration of his term

of office, he speaks of this sum as being wholly at the disposal of Pompey (*Fam.* v. 20. 9), though it apparently still remained on deposit at Ephesus for another year (*Att.* xi. 1. 2). But in February of 48 we see him lending half of it to Pompey (*Att.* xi. 2. 3). Whether he did so because he thought it a wise investment (*Att.* xi. 2. 3), or because he considered it the patriotic thing to do, and an action that would redound to his honor (*Att.* xi. 3. 3), we cannot be certain. Perhaps he was motivated by a combination of these factors. However, with the defeat of the republican cause at Pharsalia and the death of Pompey, it is doubtful whether he ever saw this money again. Whether Pompey ever got the other half of this money as well is not clear, but a year later we find Cicero, once again in his customary financial straits, speaking as though such were the case (*Att.* xi. 13. 4).

Clearly, then, his chief motives for lending money were other than financial gain. Sometimes he must have lent money out of a sense of obligation toward another person, or because he thought his position required it, at other times because he desired to enlist the recipient's favor, or simply out of friendship.⁴⁴ At any rate, from the frequent requests to Atticus to raise money somewhere, and from our knowledge that upon occasions he was compelled to dispose of property to raise money (*Att.* viii. 7. 3, xi. 4. 1), it seems very unlikely that any residue of profit remained to him from these transactions.

In connection with the subject of borrowing and lending, one additional item may be mentioned. Nepos, in his life of Atticus (4. 4), states that when Cicero was on his way to exile, Atticus made him a present of 250,000 sesterces. Nowhere in the correspondence do we find mention of any such gift, yet we do know that Atticus offered his services, financial as well as other, to his stricken friend (*Att.* iii. 11. 2, 20. 2). Nepos' statement, therefore, is probably to be explained as an inaccuracy resulting from the confusion of what was only a loan with an outright gift.⁴⁵

⁴⁴ *Att.* x. 15. 4; cf. Drumann-Groebe, *Gesch.*, VI (1929), 347, and Tyrrell-Furser, *Corr.*, I (1904), 41 f. Carcopino, *Secrets*, I, 96, states that Cicero made a practice of lending at 6%—a remunerative rate. That he lent at that rate to everyone seems to me rather unlikely. Be that as it may, 6% appears to have been the normal rate at this time, though the law permitted 12% (cf. Frank, *Survey*, I [1933], 352), and Cicero must have paid approximately the same rate as he charged.

⁴⁵ For a somewhat dimmer view of this loan, cf. Carcopino, *Secrets*, II, 286 f.

WORKS CITED BY SHORT TITLE

Boissier, *Cicero*: Boissier, Gaston. *Cicero and His Friends*. Translated by A. D. Jones. 2d ed.; London, 1897.

[Continued on next page]

⁴¹ Drumann-Groebe, *Gesch.*, VI (1929), 333.

⁴² Cf. Lichtenberger, *Priv.*, p. 20.

⁴³ *Att.* viii. 7. 3. Gold or silver bullion could be exchanged for coin at the mint (temple of Juno Moneta). Cf. Alois Frücht, *Die Geldgeschäfte bei Cicero* (Diss., Erlangen, 1912), pp. 3 f., 153; Frank, *Survey*, I (1933), 349.

Thus we conclude our review of what may be definitely ascertained about Cicero's income. Estimating on an annual basis, we can say that he received at least 780,000 sesterces from legacies and rentals, and that there are doubtless other amounts from various sources which we cannot even approximate. In the main this wealth seems honestly acquired. While we are not able to refute charges of what may, in some instances, have been extra-legal "deals," we are equally unable to prove them. It is not necessary, or perhaps even desirable, to attempt to prove that Cicero was absolutely above fault. In an age of corruption such as the first century before Christ, the wonder is not that we cannot prove that he did not accept money contrary to the law, but that we can prove that he refrained from so many unjust and profitable ventures which were considered legal and which enriched so many of his contemporaries. At any rate, we can assert that to the end of his life Cicero would still be justified in saying that he was *genere ipso pecuniae beatissimus*.

ROBERT J. SMUTNY

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

RESOURCEFUL LAZINESS

Lazy persons do not do their share of the world's work, but some of them add to its fund of humor. A good story about a resourceful lazy boy appeared in *The Reader's Digest* for October 1944, page 25:

I was spending the night with a Kentucky mountaineer and his 19-year-old son. They sat silently in front of the fire, smoking their pipes, crossing and uncrossing their legs. Finally after a long period of silence, the

father remarked, "Son, step outside and see if it's raining."

Without looking up, the son answered, "Aw, Pop, why don't ye jest call in the dog and see if he's wet?"¹

Like our ancestors, many stories have emigrated from Europe to the United States and been naturalized. Though this one has an air of freshness, it seems to have been derived, directly or indirectly, from the famous *Disciplina clericalis* of Petrus Alfonsi (1062-1110?), a Spanish Jew who had been converted to Christianity. In his work the following story is one of several about a certain lazy servant:

Alia vice dixit dominus servo noctu: "Maimunde, surge et videas utrum pluat necne." Ipse vero advocavit canem qui iacebat extra ianuam et cum venisset canis palpat pedes eius. Quibus inventis siccis domino inquit: "Domine, non pluit."²

EUGENE S. McCARTNEY

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

REVIEWS

The Apostolic Fathers. Translated by FRANCIS X. GLIMM, JOSEPH M.-F. MARIQUE, S.J., GERALD G. WALSH, S.J. ("The Fathers of the Church," [No. 1]). New York: Cima Publishing Co., [1947]. Pp. xiv, 401. \$5.00.

This volume inaugurates a new series of translations of the writings of the Fathers, presided over by an Editorial Board of eight, with the founder, Dr. Ludwig Schopp (now deceased), serving as Editorial Director.

The first translation offered, a version of the genuine letter of St. Clement of Rome, is by Father Glimm (hereinafter = G.), who also—in number of pages—makes the major contribution to the book. He states in his introduction that "the text followed in the present translation is that of Karl Bihlmeyer, *Die Apostolischen Väter* (Tübingen 1924)." G. repeats this same claim, of having used the Funk-Bihlmeyer edition, wherever this offers the best critical text. The present reviewer was startled to discover that he could find no tangible evidence of such use in the four works examined (G.'s version of the Ps.-Clementine homily was not looked into); that, on the contrary, in all these cases G. actually followed the older Lightfoot-Harmer-Lake (= Li., Ha., La.) tradition. This involves a charge of something more serious than unsatisfactory editorial procedure, and the charge should be substantiated. The following selection

Carcopino, *Secrets*: Carcopino, Jérôme. *Les secrets de la correspondance de Cicéron*. 2 vols. Paris, 1947.

Drumann-Groebe, *Gesch.*: Drumann, W. *Geschichte Roms*. Edited by P. Groebe. 6 vols. 2d ed.; Berlin and Leipzig, 1899-1929.

Frank, *Survey*: Frank, Tenney (ed.). *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome*. 6 vols. Baltimore, 1933-40.

Lichtenberger, *Priv.*: Lichtenberger, A. *De Ciceronis Re Privata*. Paris, 1895.

Mohler, *Legacies*: Mohler, S. L. "Cicero's Legacies," *TAPhA*, LXIII (1932), 73-87.

Petersson, *Biography*: Petersson, Torsten. *Cicero: A Biography*. Berkeley, 1920.

Keents, *Property*: Reents, A. H. *The Personal Property and Sources of Income of M. Tullius Cicero*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska, 1941; abstracted in *Nebraska Abstracts of Doctoral Dissertations*, II (1941), 75-83.

Tyrell-Purser, *Corr.*: Tyrell, R. Y., and Purser, L. C. (eds.). *The Correspondence of M. Tullius Cicero*. 7 vols. Dublin: Vol. I, 3d ed., 1904; Vols. II-VI, 2d ed., 1906-33; Vol. VII, 1st ed., 1901.

¹ Reprinted with the permission of *The Reader's Digest*. The story is credited to Ensign W. K. Welch.

² *Disc. cler.*, Exempl. 27 (p. 41, ed. Hilka-Söderhjelm). This story and other selections from Petrus Alfonsi may be consulted conveniently in C. H. Beeson, *Primer of Medieval Latin* (Chicago 1925) 84-96.

of evidence is submitted: In the *I Clementis* Bihlmeyer (= Bi.), on recent ms authority, rejected in 1.1, ἀδελφοί after πεπιτώσεις; in 1.3, καὶ σεμνῇ after ἀμώμῳ; in 21.1, πᾶσιν before ἡμῖν; in 33.4, κατὰ διάνοιαν after παμμέγεθες; in 59.4, τοὺς ταπεινοὺς ἐλέησον after σώσον. Li. carried all these rejected words and phrases, La. omitted some of them, G. retains them all. In 51.5, Bi. dropped the second word in ἐν γῇ Αἰγύπτῳ (Li., La.), and G. translates "in the land of Egypt." In 4.10, Bi. reads ἀρχοντα καὶ δικαστὴν for κριτὴν ἢ δικαστὴν (Li., La.), rendered "a judge or arbiter" by G. In Polycarp's *Ad Philippenses* G.'s ignorance of all of Bi.'s emendations of that part of the letter (10-14) in which a Latin translation must substitute for the lost Greek text is particularly glaring: 11.1, *moneo itaque tvos* (Li., dell. La., Bi.); 12.2, *dominum nostrum t et deum* (Li., La., del. Bi.); 14, *credo tautem* (Li., dell. La., Bi.)—all these *omittenda* reappear in G.'s version. In the *Martyrium Polycarpi* we find him reading, in 2.3, ἀνέβλεπον (Li., La.) for ἐνέβλεπον (Bi.); in 4, προδιδόντας ἑαυτούς (Li., La.) for προσόντας ἑαυτοῖς (Bi.); in 20.1, "Marcianus" (Li.) for "Marcion" (La., Bi.); etc. In the case of the *Martyrium* G.'s unawareness of Bi. can also be observed from purely external deviations: thus, the concluding sentence of Chapter 2 in Li. and La. has become the opening sentence of Chapter 3 in Bi.—but G. follows the former arrangement. Note, too, the telltale division of paragraphs retained by him in Chapter 22 and in the epilogue added from the Moscow ms. Of numerous notations made on his translation of the so-called *Letter of Barnabas*, these may be recorded: in 4.9, G. omits the middle three words (*ommm. Ha., La.*) of Bi.'s text: ὁ πᾶς χρόνος τῆς ζωῆς καὶ τῆς πίστεως ἡμῶν. The initial clause of the following paragraph in Bi.'s text forms the conclusion of §9 in Ha., La., and G. In 6.9 *init.*, G. does not follow the punctuation used by Bi. or Klauser, but that found in Ha. and La. In 19.11, τὸ πονηρόν (La., Bi.) is rendered "the Evil One" (= Ha., τὸν πονηρόν).

For the *Didache* G. states that he used Klauser's edition. This appears to be so, though in 10.3 the omission of the word "Jesus," restored by Bi. (p. xix) and Klauser before τοῦ παιδὸς σου (translated "Thy Son," which is quite certainly wrong) seems strange. But such omission may be only accidental, for a half line earlier the text corresponding to fourteen (!) Greek words has dropped out. Further omissions elsewhere: *Barn.* 1.3, μᾶλλον after διὸ καί; 6.16, the second λέγει (*om. Ha. !*); 10.5, κολλώμενος (*om. Ha. !*) after ὁμοιωθήσῃ; *Mart. Pol.* 22, καὶ πατρὶ (*om. Li. !*) in the doxology.

The translations themselves, though heavily indebted to Li. and especially to La. (also to Bigg for the *Didache*), abound in questionable renderings and stylistic infelicities: *Mart. Pol.* 2.4, "they were beaten with a variety of other kinds of torments"; 7.1, παιδάριον = "young slave," not "little boy"; 20.2, "they . . . greet

you, and Evarestus who wrote the letter and his whole house"; *Did.* 3.2, "do not become angry" is not correct for μὴ γίνου ὀργίλος; 11.2, καταλύσαι applied to a doctrine means more than to "contradict" it; 11.7, read "test [not "tempt," πειράσσετε] any prophet"; 16.6, the σημεῖον ἐκπετάσεως appearing in the heavens certainly has nothing to do with "confusion"; *Barn.* 1.1, "who loves us" for ἀγαπήσαντος is too obviously mistranslated; 4.8, "Moses, Moses, come down (κατάβηθι) quickly" misplaces the Lord (who is on top of the mountain with Moses!); 16.1, a building is strangely misplaced in "for they are the house of God"; etc.

Finally, regarding the text which G. generally uses for the *Epist. Barnabae*, this is not, as he states (202, notes 3 and 7), by Lightfoot, but by Harmer (cf. Li.-Ha., Intro., p. ix).

The second contributor to this volume (he is also one of the editors of the series) is Father Walsh (= W.), with translations of the Letters of St. Ignatius of Antioch and the *Letter to Diognetus*. From the standpoint of reading difficult Greek texts done into English, it is pleasant to turn from G.'s versions to those of W. The latter's offerings are eminently readable, and he commands great resourcefulness to make them so. But for our own reassurance regarding his treatment of the ancient text, we should have expected him to state clearly in each case what edition he followed. As it is, he seems to imply (83 and n. 1) that he has proceeded eclectically, using Li.-Ha., La., Bi. for the Ignatian texts, but says nothing about a recension followed for the apology.

For Ignatius the Berlin papyrus codex 10581 *saec. V*, which has preserved the text—free from interpolations—of the greater part of the *Letter to the Smyrnaeans*, is suggestive of a passage suitable for making trial of W.'s concern for the best text. The papyrus fragment, covering *Smyrn.* 3.3-12.1 and published by C. Schmidt and W. Schubart (1910), was collated by both La. and Bi. Of the eleven emendations made by Bi. of the Funk text, six are such as not to affect translation, and two had already been made by Li. But as to the three remaining cases, W.'s procedure is significant: in 9.2, he retains ἀμείβοι (Li.) for ἀμοιβή; in 10.2, he reads πίστις (Li.) in place of ἐλπίς; and in 11.3, "worthy of you" reflects a text having ἀξιον (Li.) instead of Θεοῦ ἀξιον. Further, for the beginning and the end of the letter, note the absence (as in Li.) in 1.1 of the second Θεοῦ (La., Bi.), and his retention in 13.2 of "Gavia" (Li.) for "Tavia" (La., Bi.).

Turning to the *Letter to Diognetus*, the fact that this unique document survives in one solitary manuscript—but a manuscript which itself survives only in transcripts—should not have been taken as an excuse, as obviously it was, for not referring to the best critical edition, that by Bihlmeyer (in his notes W. repeatedly mentions

"Lightfoot's text," but the text is Harmer's!). His translation suffers by this omission. Thus, in 2.7 *init.*, Bi.'s (and La.'s) reading, αἰνεῖν (*em.* Lachmann for οἱ νῦν νομίζοντες καὶ οἰόμενοι, is quite as conservative and easy as Li.'s, οἱ νῦν νομίζοντες καὶ σεβόμενοι (*coni.* Lachmann), and lends superior logic to the thought expressed in the sentence as a whole; and adoption of Bi.'s reading would have made it unnecessary to add twice, for clarification, the words "than the Christians do." Again, in 11.6, retention—following Bi.—of the *ms* reading ἐκκλησίας χάρις instead of following Li.'s adoption of Lachmann's conjecture, ἔ. χαρά, would have preserved the profound thought that is given. Objection is also made to the following renderings, among others: 5.2, "adopt a way of life" for βίον ἀσχεῖν; 5.3, "they are not outstanding in human learning" for οὐδὲ δόγματος ἀνθρώπων προσησπάζειν (the translator, moreover, misses the point in the context entirely: the writer states that it is not a man-devised doctrine that the Christians are interested in or champion); 5.10, "the laws that men make" for ὁρισμένοις νόμοις; 12.3, "the Scriptures are not silent" (Li-Ha.: "the scriptures state clearly") for οὐδὲ . . . ἄσκημα τὰ γεγραμμένα: what the writer means to convey is that deep significance attaches to the Scripture story (of God planting a tree of knowledge and a tree of life—Gen. 2:9).

Lastly, the scattered fragments of Papias and the very extensive *Shepherd* of Hermas have been translated by Father Marique (= M.). Though this is not stated, the arrangement and translation of the former follow the text as it appears in Li-Ha. Had he followed Bi., he would have worked with an edition purged of much textual dross carried over from most disparate sources (e.g., the five lines of fr. xii show six variations in the recension of Bi., as compared with the antiquated text of Anastasius Sinaita reproduced in Li-Ha.), and he might have decided to drop a number of fragments which contain not a single word or thought of Papias. But the product before us offends in far simpler matters. The first note (371—cf. also 228, 231) to the Introduction repeats the perennial blunder of quoting Bardenhewer's monumental work as *Geschichte der altchristlichen* (for *altkirchlichen*) *Literatur*. Another hardy perennial occurs some pages later (382): "Gregory of Nazianzen." On the same page the misspelling in Li-Ha., "Jerome, *Ad Lucinium*" (read *Lucinum*) is perpetuated. Fr. xviii is identified as coming from Apollinaris of Hierapolis († ca. 180); correct this to read Apollinaris the Younger of Laodicea († ca. 390). Diacritical marks are woefully absent in "Tub. Theol. Quartalschr." (380). Besides passing over single words of the ancient text, M. also omits passages of some length: fr. iii.10, ἀντὶ τοῦ προδότης Ἰούδα; fr. xiv, *spicarum* . . . *et unamquamque spicam habituram decem millia*. In the same passage he mistakenly refers *alvus* to *sanctorum* instead

of to *botrum* and reads "another saint"; *ibid.*, "other fruits" for *reliqua poma* needs no comment. In fr. xii, the adjective πᾶσαν obviously goes with τὴν ἐξαήμερον, not with τὴν ἐκκλησίαν. In fr. vi, Eusebius is called πολυτίστωρ: "widely-read" probably is a slip for "well-read" or "a man of wide reading"; etc.

When in 1924 Karl Bihlmeyer published his *Apostolischen Väter*, he stated in his Foreword (iv-v) that omission of the *Shepherd* was made necessary by the sensational discovery, reported from America in the previous fall, of a third-century papyrus codex covering approximately one-fourth of the *Shepherd*—a large section of the *Similitudes* (2.8-9.5.1) and a very small part of the *Mandates* (2.6-3.1). Professors Lietzmann and Lake had reported to him on this find, it was to be published "in one or two years" by Professor Campbell Bonner, and he intended to use the published papyrus in making a new recension of the *Shepherd*, thus bringing to completion his own edition of the Apostolic Fathers.

Actually, Bonner's *A Papyrus Codex of the Shepherd of Hermas* ("Univ. of Mich. Stud.," Hum. Ser., No. 22) did not appear until 1934, and Bihlmeyer died in 1942 without having given us a new edition of the *Shepherd*. In the absence of such a basis, any attempt to furnish a satisfactory modern version of the work must, to say the least, prove very difficult. Inasmuch as the Michigan codex covers a part of the text not surviving in the *Sinaiticus*, and supplies, for the part it preserves, most of the sentences omitted in the *Athous*, the requirement of also making a careful collation of Bonner's volume is most patent. M. has ignored this requirement. What is more: while giving some account (231) of the textual fate of the *Shepherd*, including a mention of the minor papyri published earlier (one group of which is labeled "Oxyrhincus" [231] and "Oxyrhincus" [398]!), no reference whatever is made to the Michigan codex! Obviously, M. was not even aware of its existence! It seemed quite supererogatory, therefore, to read, and report on, the translation given, which follows Ha.'s text, with occasional preference shown that of La.

The very evident failure of the editors properly to edit and to co-ordinate this volume is apparent from numerous other deficiencies, only a few of which can be mentioned here: the retention by G. and M. of paragraph-numerals, but omission of the same by W.; continuous note exponents by W., but a by-chapter system followed by G., with as many as three groups of notes appearing on a single page; some notes which give little or no sense—thus, 264, note 4: "Cf. Introduction page of Introduction"; the account given of Scripture, which is in especially sad state (e.g., one translator refers to a prophet as "Ez." [200], "Ezek." [210], and "Ezech." [16]); misspelled and misprinted words (besides those

already noted): "Appolinaris" (xi [in the Introduction by the Editors!], 391), "Appolonius" (391), "believing" (136), "Bycantine" for "Byzantine" (400), "byzantischen" for "byzantinischen" (380), "Globarus" for "Gobarus" (400), "Hebraeism" (201), "Weymann" for "Weyman" (232), etc.

With this volume the founder introduced a series of translations which he hoped would become "one of the great monuments of Christian scholarship in America" (General Foreword). A less auspicious beginning could scarcely be imagined.

J. C. PLUMPE

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA

Giovenale. By ENZO V. MARMORALE. ("Biblioteca di Cultura Moderna," No. 474.) 2d ed.; Bari: Laterza, 1950. Pp. 203. L. 700.

Reviews of the first edition of this monograph on Juvenal, which appeared in 1938, manifested more dissent than agreement with the author's interpretation. In the preface to the second edition, Marmorale summarizes the more important of these reviews, and states that continued study of the *Satires* has confirmed his earlier conclusions. The problem he undertook to solve is that of Juvenal's proper place in the history of Latin literature. He demonstrates to his own satisfaction that Juvenal was not a moralist, since he lacked formal education in moral philosophy, had little interest in any but the most commonplace moral or religious sentiments, and had too little good sense and too much personal bitterness and vehemence to exert a moral influence. Here one may query whether a writer with the lofty and serene view that Marmorale considers requisite for a moralist could possibly write satire. He claims that mediaeval writers did not consider Juvenal a moralist, but only a witness to pagan corruption (p. 81). This is demonstrably false, for the ethical application of many quotations from the *Satires*, and the character of the lines marked as especially notable in mediaeval manuscripts, prove that the regular inclusion of Juvenal among *auctores ethici* and the classification of his work under the category of *moralis philosophia* were not merely conventional. For a recent study that upholds Juvenal's status as a moralist, see Gilbert Highet's "The Philosophy of Juvenal" (*TAPA* 80 [1949] 254-270, esp. 255, n. 1).

Marmorale next denies Juvenal's claim to rank as a poet, partly on the ground that he rarely develops the full descriptive value of his pictures, as Petronius, for example, does, but instead gives mere miniature genre scenes with too much personal rancor for real poetry, though a few lines show some poetic gift. Whether the criterion here cited is considered a valid test of poetry or not, the conclusions of this second chapter are likely

to meet with more general agreement than those of the first. Few would place Juvenal in the top rank of poets, and the dividing-line between poetic genius and a talent for writing verse is always a difficult one to draw.

In the third and last chapter Marmorale appraises "the true Juvenal," and the reader is somewhat relieved to find that so many years of painstaking study have not been devoted to a worthless author. This final estimate is much more favorable than one would expect from the preceding chapters, for Juvenal is here presented as an able man of letters, fully trained in the rhetorical schools, rising above the common level of rhetoricians, often brilliant, persuasive and sincere enough to "find the way to our intellect or to our heart" (p. 161), even though he does not attain the status of a true poet.

EVA MATTHEWS SANFORD

SWEET BRIAR COLLEGE

Werke des Galenos. Band III: "Die Kräfte der Nahrungsmittel, Buch I-II." Translated by ERICH BEINTKER and WILHELM KAHLENBERG. Stuttgart: Hippokrates-Verlag Marquardt & Cie., 1948. Pp. 138. DM 8.50.

This book is the third volume of a projected translation of the complete works of Galen. The first two volumes of the series were devoted to *De sanitate tuenda*. The present volume includes Books 1 and 2 of *De alimentorum facultatibus*.

Book 1 deals with the cereals and legumes, Book 2 with other fruits and vegetables, and Book 3 (which is to appear in the following volume of the series) with foods derived from animals. Galen takes up one by one the various substances used for food; he discusses such matters as methods of preparing the food, its palatability, digestibility, nutritive value, strength, and its effect on the bowels, the bladder, and on the body in general.

The work is of great interest to the medical historian. It has an important bearing on the debate between Dogmatists and Empirics. It refers frequently to books no longer extant, e.g., of Diocles, Mnesitheus, Praxagoras, and Phylotimus. Because of its subject matter it also holds great interest for the student of economic and social history.

The introductory chapter of Book 1 contains an important statement of Galen's philosophy of nutrition. The Galenic (based on the Aristotelian) doctrine of "qualities" is fundamental in determining the effect of foods, but individual differences in the persons who take the food are not neglected.

Professor Beintker, a physician, and Professor Kahlenberg, a philologist, have collaborated to produce an excellent translation; this translation they have enriched with a very useful commentary in which the most recent and authoritative literature is cited. They have had the

advantage of basing their work on the fine edition of the Greek text by G. Helmreich in the *Corpus Medicorum Graecorum* (V.4.2), with its complete index and apparatus.

Throughout the work the identification of the various substances presents great difficulties. Here the editors do not gloss over the problems, but indicate the probabilities and base their conclusions on modern research. In the case of the cereals, N. Jasny's *The Wheats of Antiquity* (Baltimore 1944) seems not to have been available to them.

The excellence of the present volume makes one all the more hopeful that the whole project will eventually progress to successful completion.

MIRIAM DRABKIN

NEW YORK CITY

Glottologia indeuropea: Manuale di grammatica comparata delle lingue indeuropee con speciale riguardo del greco e del latino. By VITTORE PISANI. 2d ed.; Torino: Rosenberg & Sellier, 1949. Pp. xl, 310. \$4.60.

This volume is planned to give a general account of Indo-European comparative linguistics, with special attention to Greek and Latin. The introductory sections include summary accounts of the IE languages, of the development of comparative studies in IE, of the reconstruction of the IE and connected problems, of the plan of the present work, with a brief bibliography (Buck's *Grammar of Oscan and Umbrian* is given only in Prokosch's German translation; Baugh's *History of the English Language* receives no listing). Then, after an explanation of the phonetic symbols, there are chapters on the phonetics of IE (pp. 9-98), morphology (99-240; divided into generalities, noun and pronoun, finite verb), syntax (241-256), composition (257-263), lexicon (264-279). Every chapter and part of chapter named above consists of three parts: general, Greek, Latin. The volume closes with indexes of scholars and topics (281-283), and of words cited as examples (285-310). The first edition of this work is not available to me as I prepare this short review.

The present volume contains an immense amount of information on the comparative linguistics of IE, not merely of Greek and Latin, but also of Sanskrit and other languages (the index of words cites numerous words from fourteen different languages, and a few from each of twenty-six others); but the space limitations require the phonetic and morphological formulations to be given in an extremely compressed style, and reading is therefore rather slow and difficult. On the other hand, many Sanskrit paradigms are given in full with those of Greek and Latin, as well as a considerable number of those of Gothic, Lithuanian, and Old Church

Slavonic (which the author still calls Old Bulgarian). Naturally, as Pisani is a very original worker, he presents many points of interpretation which I doubt or cannot accept; but these form an insignificant part of the total, and affect few if any generalizations.

For those who read Italian easily (even the abbreviations!) and have already made via the ordinary languages their entrance into historical linguistics (cf. the same scholar's *Introduzione alla Linguistica indeuropea*,³ reviewed by me in *Language* 25 [1949] 196-198), this volume provides an excellent synthesis of what they have previously learned, and also materially advances the boundaries of their linguistic knowledge.

ROLAND G. KENT

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

Euripides, Helena. Edited with Commentary and General Remarks by A. Y. CAMPBELL. Liverpool: University Press, 1950. Pp. xviii, 172. 12s. 6d.

The *Helena* is a delightful play, and a new edition which would help to introduce its charms to a wider audience, by smoothing out some of the play's undeniable difficulties and offering some exegetical aid to the less experienced student, would be of real service. Professor Campbell's edition, however, is designed for a very different, and in the reviewer's opinion, a much less useful purpose. It constitutes the second campaign in a crusade by Campbell to restore textual criticism, now becoming "the Cinderella of classical studies" (p. xiv), to a place of dignity, and it is marked by the same profusion of conjectural emendations as its forerunner in the crusade, the edition of Horace's *Odes* and *Epodes* (London 1945).

The editor's purpose is "to offer solutions of all difficulties not already settled by previous editors or critics" (p. 55), in itself no slight undertaking; but Campbell goes much further and offers solutions for many passages where no difficulty ever existed. He prints more than one hundred and sixty new conjectures, and at least as many earlier conjectures which have not been generally accepted; he enriches the play with eight lines of his own composition (to fill imagined gaps in the text), and transposes lines freely. Only a few of the conjectures are intrinsically bad, for Campbell is an accomplished Hellenist, but the great majority are bad in effect, because unnecessary. If the reader can surrender himself to the ingenuity and wit of Campbell's notes he will enjoy this book; otherwise he will feel more exasperation than satisfaction.

A few examples will illustrate the general nature of this edition. Line 1488, *synnomoī nepheōn dromou*, is rejected for no good reason and replaced by *syndromoi nepheōn chorou*—not without elegance, but entirely unnecessary and not as good as the phrase it replaces. In

577 Campbell reads to *d' asaphes m' apostrophei*, exclaiming "in A.D. 1949 I can apparently get away with an elementary correction like this." He gets away with very little, for the better part of the conjecture (*apostrophei*) was proposed long ago by Musgrave; the rest of it is inferior to the traditional text. Among the valuable suggestions are the reading of 1225, which is the best yet proposed, with just the required *double entente*, and the treatment of certain lyrical passages (e.g. 625-697). On the whole, though, the bad far outweighs the good.

The brief "Remarks on the Play" (pp. 157-169) contain some good comments, especially on the characters of Menelaus and Helen.

GORDON M. KIRKWOOD

CORNELL UNIVERSITY

Saint Augustine's De Fide Rerum Quae Non Videntur. Edited and translated, with Introduction and Commentary, by Sister MARY FRANCIS McDONALD. ("The Catholic University of America, Patristic Studies," Vol. LXXXIV.) Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1950. Pp. xvi, 147. \$1.75.

This study provides a critical text, a commentary, and a translation of Augustine's *De fide*. In establishing her text, Dr. McDonald devotes thirty pages of her Introduction to the description, comparison, and classification of the twenty-six manuscripts which she has used. In a carefully thought-out exposition, she develops acceptable stemmata for the two families to which these manuscripts belong. Her fourteen-page discussion of the authenticity of the brief apology (for to this rhetorical type she assigns the treatise) not only presents a strong presumption of its genuineness, but also indicates her minute acquaintance with the content and style of Augustine's voluminous works. The introductory section on style (pp. 57-72) shows intimate knowledge of classical rhetoric and its employment by Augustine.

The text and translation occupy opposite pages. Although this reviewer does not uniformly agree with the author's conclusions, his differing opinion concerns only minor variants. He agrees with her choice of readings in the more difficult instances, such as those in section 9, which she competently discusses on pages 136-138 of the Commentary. She ably employs her knowledge of palaeography in discussing lines 22-23 of this section. The translation is clear and accurate, and preserves the spirit of Augustine's expression remarkably well in spite of the barrier of translation.

The Commentary (116-143) is a helpful compendium of explanatory material and comment. The author employs to good advantage her extensive knowledge of the Scriptures, Cicero, and earlier patristic literature in illustrating Augustine's defence of that faith which is the

evidence of things not seen. Tertullian, Cyprian, Ambrose, and Jerome all contribute to various parts of Dr. McDonald's explication. The Bibliography on pages xiii-xvi and the bibliographical citations in the Introduction and Commentary show an exhaustive yet selective scholarship.

This study is a worthy addition to our modern study of the Fathers. It is gratifying to note the competence of the various efforts to acquaint readers with this neglected part of the literature of the world.

JOHN PAUL PRITCHARD

UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

Anthologia Lyrica Graeca. Edited by ERNESTUS DIEHL. Fasc. 1, Poetae Elegiaci; Fasc. 2, Theognis, ps.-Pythagoras, ps.-Phocylides, Chares, Anonymi Aulodia. 3d ed.; Leipzig: Teubner, 1949-1950. Pp. iv, 144; viii, 116. \$2.40, \$1.97.

Because of Diehl's death, this third edition of his *Anthologia* was completed and seen through the press by Rudolph Beutler. In conformity with the new issues of the Teubner Texts, these volumes have a larger format, but otherwise are of about the same character and quality as the two earlier editions. The first edition appeared in 1925, the second in 1936. From the beginning Diehl's work was characterized by good critical apparatus, full lists of *testimonia*, and excellent bibliographies, which made it more useful than any corpus of the Lyric Poets except Bergk's famous edition. Parallel references to Bergk's fourth edition of the *Lyrici Graeci* are continued in this third edition of the *Anthologia*.

The arrangement of the material varies somewhat from that of the first two editions. Fascicle 1 begins with Callinus, as before, but ends with the *Fragmenta Elegiaca Aesopota*. Fascicle 2 begins with Theognis and ends with *Anonymi Aulodia*. These two volumes represent about half of the bulk of the second edition, which means that each new volume, though wider and longer, is much thinner than in the first two editions. The present reviewer finds the size and format of these new Teubner volumes not only more attractive in appearance but much more convenient to use. Other fascicles, no doubt, will follow in the course of time to complete the new edition.

The bibliographies have been expanded considerably. For example, the references to works on Theognis in the second edition (1936) occupied half of one (smaller) page, but in this third edition the corresponding bibliography has been expanded to a full page of larger size.

It is heartening to find German scholars, who have experienced such trying times, now more and more reviving their indispensable contributions to classical scholarship. The Teubner Press likewise deserves our

heartily thanks for beginning *de novo* the work of re-issuing a famous series of Greek and Roman texts. It is to be hoped that the future will be kindly, and that we can once again see fully restored the kind of scholarship that is represented by Diehl's *Anthologia Lyrica Graeca*.

E. L. HIGHBARGER

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

Die Praescriptio Tertullians im Lichte des römischen Rechts und der Theologie. By JOSEPH KASPAR STIRNIMANN. ("Paradosis: Beiträge zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur und Theologie," No. 3.) Freiburg in der Schweiz: Paulusverlag, 1949. Pp. xii, 180. S. Fr. 6.50.

Here is another welcome addition to the growing series of recent works devoted to the elucidation of Tertullian who, if Norden was right in calling him "ohne Frage der schwierigste Autor in lateinischer Sprache," is certainly one of the most rewarding.

Though not so labeled, this would appear to be a dissertation: it bears some of the *stigmata tironis*—a certain cloying repetitiousness, and some blemishes which can hardly be misprints, e.g., *Constitutio Antoniana* (p. 31) and *qua postetate* (108). Yet the author's main purpose, indicated in the title, to show the rich acquaintance of Tertullian with the terminology of Roman law, particularly illustrated by one such term, *praescriptio*, is abundantly successful. Even so, he does not go so far as to identify Tertullian the theologian with the contemporary jurist and namesake mentioned in the Pandects of Justinian. In Roman law the *praescriptio* was a means of protecting the possessor of provincial real estate from eviction by another claimant; such protection was afforded by means of restriction and delay. Tertullian employs this concept with telling effect against the heretics who here represent the other claimants, the Catholics being the party in possession: *nunc solum dis-*

putandum est quibus competat fides ipsa, cuius sunt [Stirnemann capably defends this reading of Kroymann against the *sint* of all other editors] *scripturae, a quo et per quos et quando et quibus sit tradita disciplina, qua fiunt Christiani* (*De pr. haer.* 19). Latin literature was not in a decline when men could write like that! While Stirnemann's conclusions are not startlingly new, it is good to have a monograph on this topic.

The volume is beautifully printed on good paper and with a minimum of misprints. With it, we welcome a new series edited by Father Othmar Perler, who has already published (No. 1) Leonard Weber's *Hauptfragen der Moraltheologie Gregors des Grossen* (1947) and (No. 2) Father Andreas Schmid's *Die Christologie Isidors von Pelusium* (1948).

G. E. McCracken

DRAKE UNIVERSITY

Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Griechischen. By J. B. HOFMANN. Munich: Oldenbourg, 1949-50. Pp. 433. DM 13.84.

The work under review is a side product of Hofmann's re-edition of A. Walde's *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, and another evidence of this scholar's admirable ability to work even under most unfavorable conditions. The idea of the publication was conceived in the midst of the German holocaust; the proof sheets were read when the author, severely crippled, was in a hospital. Originally planned as a kind of lexilogus, the work grew to become a full-fledged etymological dictionary. It is narrower in scope than Boisacq's *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*, and for technical reasons does not contain bibliographical notes. Nevertheless Hofmann's smaller and incidentally cheaper work will equally well serve the purposes of students of Greek who are not especially interested in linguistic research. They can rely on Hofmann's etymological interpretations as far as there is reliability in etymologies. The author of a systematic etymological dictionary is in a particularly unpleasant situation. He cannot be expected to proffer good new etymologies by the hundred. In principle, the most promising way to an evident or at least plausible etymology is the monograph on a single word which studies all its literary occurrences, word-formation and derivations, formally and semantically related words, as well as the historical and cultural background of the word, if necessary, far beyond the borders of the language to which it belongs. The author of an etymological dictionary is not in a position for such detailed research. In most cases he is forced to choose between different etymologies suggested by other scholars, and such a choice is bound to be as subjective as so many etymologies are in themselves. Under these cir-

VIDES UT ALTA STET NIVE . . .

Dr. James Edward Church, retired professor of Greek at the University of Nevada, is described in *Time* magazine (November 5, 1951, p. 73) as "the father of the snow survey"—the rough and rugged practical science of measuring the snowpack on high mountains."

cumstances, the user, and especially the linguistically untrained user, of this new Greek dictionary will all the more appreciate Hofmann's sober caution, which induces him to mark a very large number of the listed etymologies as doubtful or as merely possible.

A. NEHRING

FORDHAM UNIVERSITY

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

This department is conducted by LIONEL CASSON, Contributing Editor, with the assistance of PHILIP MAYERSON. The list is compiled from current bibliographical catalogues and publishers' trade lists, American, Belgian, British, Dutch, French, German, Italian, Spanish, and Swiss, and includes books received at the editorial office. Some errors and omissions are inevitable, but *CW* makes every effort to ensure accuracy and completeness.

GENERAL

Wegner, Max. *Altertumskunde*. 334 pages. Freiburg: Alber, 1951 18 M.

ANCIENT AUTHORS

Aristophanes. Ehrenberg, Victor. *The People of Aristophanes: A Sociology of Old Attic Comedy*. Second edition, xx, 418 pages, 19 plates. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1951 \$5.00

Aristotle. *The Nicomachean Ethics of Aristotle*. A Commentary by Harold Henry Joachim, edited by D. A. Rees. vii, 304 pages. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951 25s.

— *Physica*. Edited by W. D. Ross. 214 pages. New York: Oxford, 1951 (Oxford Classical Texts) \$2.25

— Montmollin, Daniel de. *La Poétique d'Aristote*. Texte primitif et additions ultérieures. 375 pages. Neuchâtel: Messelier, 1951 (Dissertation) 18 Swiss fr.

— Runner, H. Evan. *The Development of Aristotle Illustrated from the Earliest Books of the Physics*. 157 pages. Kampen: Kok, 1951 5.75 gldrs.

Juvenal. Helmbold, W. C. *The Structure of Juvenal*. 13 pages. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1951 (Univ. of Cal. Publications in Classical Philology, vol. 14, no. 2) 25¢

Lucretius. *On the Nature of the Universe*. Transl. with an introduction by R. E. Latham. 256 pages. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1951

Plato. Ross, Sir David. *Plato's Theory of Ideas*. viii, 252 pages. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951 18s.

— Tuckey, T. G. *Plato's Charmides*. xiii, 116 pages. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1951 \$2.75

Seneca. *Letters to Lucilius*. Translated by F. P. Parker. 2 vols., 350, 334 pages. New York: Oxford, 1951 \$3.00

Sophocles. Goheen, Robert F. *The Imagery of Sophocles' Antigone. A Study of Poetic Language and Structure*. viii, 171 pages. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1951 \$3.00

Terence. Barbieri, Antonio. *La vis comica in Terenzio*. Con pref. di G. B. Pighi. 300 pages. Arona: Paideia, 1951 (Dissertation) 1500 L.

LINGUISTICS, GRAMMAR, METRICS

Ernout, A., and A. Meillet. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine. Histoire des mots*. Vol. 2: M-Z, index. Third edition, pages 668-1385. Paris: Klincksieck, 1951

Hofmann, J. B. *Lateinische Umgangssprache*. 3. Aufl., mit Nachtr. xvi, 211 pages. Heidelberg: Winter, 1951 7.10 M. (Nachtr. only, 1.80 M.)

Kukenheim, L. *Contributions à l'histoire de la grammaire grecque, latine et hébraïque à l'époque de la renaissance*. x, 143 pages. Leiden: Brill, 1951 18 gldrs.

Neuss, Waldemar. *Lateinische Wortkunde. Auf etymol. Grundlage nach Wortfamilien geordnet*. 156 pages. Münster: Aschendorff, 1951 3.90 M.

NOTES AND NEWS

This department deals with events of interest to classicists; the contribution of pertinent items is welcomed. Also welcome are items for the section of *Personalia*, which deals with appointments, promotions, fellowships, and other professionally significant activities of our colleagues in high schools, colleges, and universities.

The **Classical Association of New England** is again offering a scholarship of \$200 for study at the Summer Session, School of Classical Studies, American Academy in Rome, to be awarded to a secondary school teacher who is a member of the Association. The current award is for the Summer Session of July and August 1952. Application blanks may be obtained from Professor F. Warren Wright, Smith College, Northampton, Mass., and should be returned to him not later than March 1, 1952.

GRANTS FOR SUMMER STUDY IN NUMISMATICS

The American Numismatic Society offers ten grants-in-aid for study in a Seminar in Numismatics to be held at its Museum, June through August, 1952. These grants will be available to students of high competence who will have completed one year's graduate study in Classics, Archaeology, Oriental Languages, History, Economics, Art, or other humanistic fields. Each study-grant will

carry a stipend of \$500 plus some allowance for travel expenses to New York. The purpose of the grants is to provide a selected number of graduate students with a wider understanding of the indispensable contribution which numismatics makes to other fields of study.

The program of the Seminar will include assigned reading, attendance at discussions conducted by visiting specialists in selected fields, preparation of a paper on a topic of the student's selection, and actual contact with the coinages related to that topic. Problems will be treated which relate to such matters as the following: the evidential values of coin hoards and excavation coins, coins and the early history of Greek city states, Byzantine art history from coins, disappearance of gold coinage in Western Europe and its later reappearance, migration and imitation of mediaeval coin types, contribution of Islamic coins to history and art.

Among those who will participate as specialists are: Alfred R. Bellinger, Professor of Classics, Yale University; Glanville Downey, Associate Professor of Byzantine Literature, Dumbarton Oaks Research Library, Harvard University; Albert M. Friend, Professor of Art and Archaeology, Princeton University; Harald Ingholt, Associate Professor of Classics and Art, Yale University; Thomas O. Mabbott, Professor of English, Hunter College; George C. Miles, Curator of Islamic Coins, Museum of the American Numismatic Society; W. P. Wallace, Professor of Ancient History, University of Toronto.

This offer is restricted to students at universities in the United States and Canada. Further information and application forms may be obtained from Sawyer McA. Mosser, Secretary, The American Numismatic Society, Broadway at 155th Street, New York 32, N. Y. Completed applications must be filed by April 1, 1952.

RENAISSANCE OF LATIN

TEACH WITH THE TOOLS OF TODAY

Reach the eye, the ear, the voice

Set an impersonal standard

Drill in unison or individually

Let them take the records home

The solution for the slow student

The answer to modern problems

"Tutor That Never Tires"

RICHARD H. WALKER

8 Masterton Road

Bronxville 8, N. Y.

YOUR STUDENT LIKES MACHINES

He has never lived without them

Make them part of his learning

Save yourself and serve him

Let him learn what mastery is

Let him try for higher goals

Let him learn the Latin easily

Instructional Records — 78 R.P.M. — Priced at \$2.00 per Record

THREE NEW VINYLITE RECORDS

- ☐ Introduction to pronunciation for student response.
- ☐ Present active indicative, four conjugations, drilled and tested.
- ☐ First four minutes of First Oration dramatically done in Latin and in parallel English phrasing.

FIRST YEAR RECORDINGS VINYLITE

- ☐ 1. a) The subject, direct object, and predicate noun in English
b) The subject, direct object, and predicate noun in Latin
- ☐ 2. a) First declension case-use-ending drill
b) Present tense, Active voice, First conjugation
- ☐ 3. a) Second declension, masculine
b) Second declension, neuter
- ☐ 4. a) Present tense, Passive voice, First conjugation
b) Sum in the Present, Imperfect, and Future Tenses
- ☐ 5. a) Mic-haec-hoc
b) Ille-illa-illud
- ☐ 6. a) Imperfect tense, Active voice, all conjugations
b) Future tense, Active voice, all conjugations
- ☐ 7. a) Grammar test, for the first half year
b) Test on quis, is, hic, and ille in use
- ☐ 8. a) Third declension, masculine and feminine

- ☐ b) Third declension adjectives, two terminations
- ☐ 9. a) Perfect tense, Active voice, all verbs
b) Perfect tense, Passive voice, all verbs
- ☐ 10. a) Drill on forms of ego, tu, sui
b) Test on use of ego, sui, is, and qui
- ☐ 11. a) Regular comparison of adjectives
b) Regular comparison of adverbs
- ☐ 12. a) Grammar test for the First Year
b) Continued

SECOND YEAR RECORDINGS VINYLITE

- ☐ 1) A—Reading Vocabulary for the Second Year (Bk. I, Caesar, Ch's 1-4)*
B—Reading Vocabulary for the Second Year (Bk. I, Caesar, Ch's 5-8)*
- ☐ 2) A—Reading Vocabulary for the Second Year (Bk. I, Caesar, Ch's 9-13)*
B—Reading Vocabulary for the Second Year (Bk. I, Caesar, Ch's 14-19)*
- ☐ 3) A—Reading Vocabulary for the Second Year (Bk. I, Caesar, Ch's 20-28)*
B—Reading Vocabulary for the Second Year (Bk. I, Caesar, Ch's 29-41)*
- ☐ 4) A—Reading Vocabulary for the Second Year (Bk. I, Caesar, Ch's 42-53)*
B—Reading Vocabulary for the Second Year (Caesar, Beyond Bk. I)*
- ☐ 5) A—New York State Mastery List, English to Latin (ab-ee)*
B—New York State Mastery List, English to Latin (eques-mile)*

- ☐ 6) A—New York State Mastery List, English to Latin (mitto-propter)*
B—New York State Mastery List, English to Latin (pugno-volnus)*
*Arranged from English to Latin, alphabetically.
- ☐ 7) A—Drill on Second Year Adjective-Noun Combinations.
B—Drill on Second Year Adjective-Noun Combinations.
- ☐ 8) A—Drill on Subjunctive Tense Forms, Third Singular, Active
B—Drill on Subjunctive Tense Forms, by Sequences, Active and Passive*
*Third Persons Singular, Present-Perfect, Imperfect-Pluperfect.
- ☐ 9) A—Explanation of Seven Basic Uses of the Subjunctive Mode.
B—Drill on Identifying Seven Basic Uses from English Sentences.
- ☐ 10) A—Explanation and Drill in English on Indirect Statement.
B—Drill in Translating into Latin Subject Accusative and Infinitive.
- ☐ 11) A—Drill on the Twenty-Nine Third Conjugation Verbs on the Second Year Mastery List. Repetition of Principal Parts.
B—Drill on the Principal Parts of First, Second, Fourth, and Irregular Verbs on the Second Year Mastery List.
- ☐ 12) A—Test on the Syntactical Principles Common to the Second Year.
B—Test on the Syntactical Principles of the Second Year (cont.).